

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action of Examiner Jonathan D. Schlaifer mailed 23 Sep 2004.

Claims 13-14, 18, 20, and 22 are in the case, none as yet allowed.

Double Patenting

Claim 14 has been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claim 18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,748,425 B1. Such a rejection may be overcome by a timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c).

Applicants submit herewith the required terminal disclaimer, and request that this rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claims 13 and 20 have been objected to for informalities. Applicants have amended the claims to correct the informalities as required, and request that the

objections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended these claims to more clearly state the technological basis, and request that this rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 14 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Vaughn et al. (U.S. Patent 6,353,446 B1, hereinafter Vaughn).

Vaughn provides a method and system for integrating network management applications whereby a service personnel may customize a browser based help desk window.

Applicants invention, on the other hand, provides for the creation of forms in collaboration space which may be used by members of collaboration space in creating and publishing pages based on the forms.

Applicants have amended claims 14 and 18 to clarify this aspect of their invention, and request that this

rejection of the claims 14 and 18 be withdrawn, and the claims allowed.

Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Amstein et al. (U.S. Patent 5,793,966, hereinafter Amstein).

Amstein provides for creation and maintenance of online services involving the creation of forms. However, there is no discussion of collaboration space, nor of the workflow process for creating forms and publishing pages created from these forms.

Applicants have amended claim 20 to clarify that their invention relates to the creation of forms in collaboration space which may be used by members of collaboration space in creating and publishing pages based on the forms, and request that the rejection of claim 20 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 13 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Ivanov (U.S. Patent 5,706,452).

Ivanov describes a method and apparatus for structuring and managing the participatory evaluation documents by a

plurality of reviewers. Personal computers are used to create, access, modify, and delete data which is shared. A designer specifies the application to be implemented by entering a workflow graph description in the system, which is stored as a set of records in a database using a database management system. This workflow graph description specifies, apparently, reviews, roles, stages, and documents which are collectively called workflow objects.

What Ivanov does not teach, and which is specified by applicants claims 13 and 22, as amended, is the creation of forms in collaboration space from which pages may be created, with the creator of the form specifying the specific process to be followed in publishing pages created from the form.

Applicants, therefore, request that the rejection of claims 13 and 22 be withdrawn, and these claims allowed.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants urge that the case passed to issue with claims 13-14, 18, 20, and 22.

The Application is believed to be in condition for

allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the Application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Sincerely,

C. M. Duffy, et al.

By



Shelley M. Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 23 Dec 2004

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Attorney at Law

61 Glenmont Road
Woodlawn, VA 24381-1341

Phone: (276) 238-1972
Fax: (276) 238-1545